

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed February 13, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Continued Examination*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on December 27, 2004; July 15, 2005; August 26, 2005; and November 22, 2005.

Claims 1-55 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. New dependent claims 56-67 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-67 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1-4, 21, 22, 38 and 51 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraphs 3-23 of the Official Action continue to reject claims 1-55 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,902,688 to Antoniadis and U.S. Patent No. 6,049,167 to Onitsuka, either alone or in combination with one or more of the following: U.S. Patent No. 5,945,967 to Rallison; U.S. Patent No. 5,534,314 to Wadley; U.S. Patent No. 6,495,198 to Peng; U.S. Patent 6,537,607 to Swanson; U.S. Patent No. 5,921,836 to Nanto; U.S. Patent 4,672,265 to Eguchi; and U.S. Patent No. 6,294,892 to Utsugi. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference

teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 1-4, 21, 22, 38 and 51 have been amended to recite that an evaporation cell comprises a tip formed into an orifice, which is supported in the present specification, for example, at page 7, lines 1-3, and Figures 1 and 2. By using the claimed evaporation cell, there is an advantage that an evaporation material ejected through the orifice gains directivity (see, e.g., page 7, lines 1-6 of the present specification). Antoniadis and Onitsuka, either alone or in combination with one or more of Rallison, Wadley, Peng, Swanson, Nanto, Eguchi and Utsugi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.


Antoniadis appears to teach placing an organic electroluminescence material into a crucible 171 (see Figure 10). Antoniadis and Onitsuka, either alone or in combination with one or more of Rallison, Wadley, Peng, Swanson, Nanto, Eguchi and Utsugi do not teach or suggest replacing the crucible of Antoniadis with an evaporation cell comprising a tip formed into an orifice.

Since Antoniadis and Onitsuka, either alone or in combination with one or more of Rallison, Wadley, Peng, Swanson, Nanto, Eguchi and Utsugi do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 56-67 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. The features of claims 56-67 are supported by the specification at page 7, lines 1-6, for example. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 56-67 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789